



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/884,873	06/30/1997	PHILLIP DAN COOK	ISIS-2202	6678

32650 7590 03/04/2004

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP  
ONE LIBERTY PLACE - 46TH FLOOR  
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER

BAKER, MAURIE GARCIA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1639

DATE MAILED: 03/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

08/884,873

Applicant(s)

COOK, PHILLIP DAN

Examiner

Maurie G. Baker

Art Unit

1639

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 20 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: Please see attached.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \_\_\_\_\_.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 2-5,7 and 33.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## ADVISORY ACTION

### *Attachment*

1. Applicant's After Final amendment filed January 20, 2004 raises new issues which would require further search and consideration and does not place the case in better form for appeal. Thus the amendment will not be entered.
2. Applicant's arguments are moot in view of the non-entry of the amendment. Thus, all rejections are maintained for reasons of record. The non-entry of the amendment is discussed more fully below.
3. The instant case is subject to an election of species requirement, which applicant responded to in Paper No. 15, filed February 7, 2000. As stated in previous actions (see, for example, Office Action mailed July 2, 2002 (Paper No. 28), paragraph 3), a search of applicant's *specific* elected species did not result in identification of any prior art. Thus, the search was extended as per MPEP § 803.02 "should no prior art be found that anticipates or renders obvious the elected species, the search of the Markush-type claim will be extended. If prior art is then found that anticipates or renders obvious the Markush-type claim with respect to a nonelected species, the Markush-type claim shall be rejected and claims to the nonelected species held withdrawn from further consideration. The prior art search, however, will not be extended unnecessarily to cover all nonelected species". The examiner extended the search and art was found reading on the instant claims; see previous action, rejection over Usbeck et al in view of Gordeev et al and Gordon et al.
4. As also stated in MPEP § 803.02 (emphasis added):  
  
Should applicant, in response to this rejection of the Markush-type claim, overcome the rejection, as by amending the Markush-type claim to exclude the species anticipated or rendered obvious by the prior art, the amended Markush-type claim will be reexamined. The prior art search will be extended to the extent

necessary to determine patentability of the Markush-type claim. In the event prior art is found during the reexamination that anticipates or renders obvious the amended Markush-type claim, the claim will be rejected and the action made final. *Amendments submitted after the final rejection further restricting the scope of the claim may be denied entry.*

5. Thus, as the proposed amendment is to delete the species rendered obvious by the prior art, the entry of such would require further search as to the non-elected species.

This is improper After Final and the amendment will not be entered.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maurie Garcia Baker, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (571) 272-0805. The examiner is on an increased flextime schedule; the best time to contact the examiner is Monday-Friday from 6:00-10:00 a.m.

7. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew J. Wang, can be reached at (571) 272-0811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Maurie Garcia Baker, Ph.D.  
February 24, 2004



MAURIE GARCIA BAKER PH.D.  
PRIMARY EXAMINER